

E-Filed 12/8/06

NOT FOR CITATION
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

HOLDEN W. GREEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.,

Defendants.

Case Number C 06-3321 JF (PVT)

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
DISMISS WITHOUT LEAVE TO
AMEND AND DISMISSING ACTION
WITH PREJUDICE

[Doc. No. 6]

Defendants move to dismiss Plaintiff's first amended complaint without leave to amend as barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*. The Court has considered the briefing submitted by the parties as well as the oral arguments submitted at the hearing on December 8, 2006. For the reasons discussed below, the motion will be granted without leave to amend.

I. BACKGROUND

In this action, Plaintiff Holden W. Green ("Green") alleges that he was a graduate student in the Executive MBA Program for Professionals ("EPMBA program") at the University of San Francisco's Masagung Graduate School of Management. He further alleges that he received a failing grade in a course called Information System One ("IS1") during his first semester in the EPMBA program. He alleges that the entire grade for the IS1 class rested on a group project; that he participated in the group project; that the group had turned in a version of the project that

1 excluded Green's name and work product; that the professor gave Green an "incomplete" on the
2 project while giving the rest of the group a grade of B+; that Green thereafter was required to
3 submit his individual contribution to the project for grading as a stand-alone submission; and that
4 he was given a grade of F on that stand-alone submission. The F caused his grade point average
5 to drop below that required for the EP MBA program and as a result he was dismissed from the
6 program. He was advised that any attempts to attend further classes would be viewed as criminal
7 trespass. His administrative appeals were denied.

8 On May 4, 2005, Green filed a state court action in the San Francisco Superior Court
9 against the University and its president, seeking preliminary and permanent injunctive relief.¹
10 That complaint alleged that Green was improperly dismissed from the EP MBA program because
11 of the failing grade in the IS1 class; that the failing grade was improperly imposed upon him even
12 though he participated in a group assignment that garnered a B+; and that he was denied the
13 opportunity to make up the grade for the IS1 class. He sought a temporary restraining order,
14 preliminary injunctive relief and permanent injunctive relief requiring the University to permit
15 him to make up the failing grade and to complete the EP MBA program at the 2003-2004 tuition
16 rate, and restraining the University from pressing or threatening to press trespass charges against
17 him. The superior court sustained the defendants' demurrer without leave to amend and entered
18 judgment for the defendants on July 14, 2005. It does not appear that Green appealed that
19 judgment.

20 Green filed the instant action on May 19, 2006, and amended once as of right by filing the
21 operative first amended complaint ("FAC") approximately one month later. This action, based
22 upon the same allegedly unfair failing grade in the IS1 class, asserts the following claims against
23 the University, its Board of Trustees, the business school, the dean, the associate dean and the
24 professor who gave him the failing grade: (1) violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act;
25 (2) conspiracy in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3); (3) violation of the Fourteenth Amendment
26

27 ¹ The Court takes judicial notice of the complaint and other documents filed in the state
28 court action, attached as exhibits A through K to Defendants' request for judicial notice.

1 due process clause; (4) violation of the Fifth Amendment due process clause; (5) violation of the
 2 Higher Education Act of 1965; (6) violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act; (7) unjust
 3 enrichment; (8) intentional misrepresentation; (9) intentional interference with prospective
 4 economic advantage; (10) breach of contract; (11) negligent hiring and retention; and (12)
 5 intentional infliction of emotional distress.

6 II. DISCUSSION

7 Defendants contend that the instant action is barred under the doctrine of *res judicata*.
 8 That doctrine provides that a valid final judgment on the merits of an action bars the parties or
 9 their privies from later asserting claims that were or could have been raised in the earlier action.
 10 *Riven v. Regions Bank of Louisiana*, 522 U.S. 470, 476 (1998). The phrase “were or could have
 11 been raised” refers to “legal theories arising out of the same transactional nucleus of facts, rather
 12 than to distinct causes of action.” *Hells Canyon Preservation Council v. United States Forest*
 13 *Service*, 403 F.3d 683, 686 n.2 (2005). The Ninth Circuit has made clear that the doctrine does
 14 not go so far as to bar *any* claims that could have been joined in the original action, but only
 15 those claims arising out of the same facts that were litigated in the original action. *Id.*

16 All of the claims in the instant action clearly arise out of the same facts that formed the
 17 basis of the state court action. Moreover all of the claims asserted in the instant action could
 18 have been asserted in the state court action. Green does not appear to dispute that these elements
 19 of the *res judicata* doctrine are met.

20 The disputed portion of this motion centers on whether the state court judgment
 21 constituted a final judgment on the merits sufficient to trigger the doctrine of *res judicata* with
 22 respect to the instant claims. Federal courts apply the doctrine of *res judicata* to a state court
 23 judgment to the same extent that courts of that state would apply the doctrine. *Eichman v.*
 24 *Fotomat Corp.*, 759 F.2d 1434, 1438 (9th Cir. 1985); *Moore v. City of Costa Mesa*, 678 F.Supp.
 25 1448, 1450 (C.D. Cal. 1987). Under California law, a superior court judgment on an order
 26 sustaining a demurrer without leave to amend is a final judgment on the merits for purposes of
 27 *res judicata* analysis. *Crowley v. Modern Faucet Manufacturing*, 44 Cal.2d 321, 323 (1955).
 28 “The fact that a plaintiff requests a different type of relief, or even presents a different legal

1 theory, does not negate or lessen the binding effect of the previous state court judgment.”
2 *Moore*, 678 F.Supp. at 1450. Accordingly, the Court concludes that the doctrine of *res judicata*
3 bars all of the claims alleged in the instant complaint.

4 Green argues that the doctrine does not apply, because the superior court’s determination
5 that he was not entitled to *preliminary* injunctive relief did not constitute a final adjudication on
6 the merits of his claim based upon the failing grade. The law is clear that the denial of
7 preliminary injunctive relief does not constitute an adjudication on the merits – it merely reflects
8 the court’s conclusion that the defendant should not be restrained pending trial on the merits.
9 *See, e.g., Continental Banking Co. v. Katz*, 68 Cal.2d 512, 528 (1968). However, Green’s state
10 court complaint sought not only preliminary injunctive relief – which was denied in an order
11 prior to the order sustaining the demurrer without leave to amend – but also *permanent* injunctive
12 relief. Green has cited no authority, and this Court has located none, suggesting that a defense
13 judgment on a complaint seeking *permanent* injunctive relief is not a judgment on the merits for
14 *res judicata* purposes.

15 The Court notes that the individual defendants in the instant action were not defendants in
16 the state court action. However, employees of a previously successful party may raise the *res*
17 *judicata* bar against subsequent litigation by the same plaintiff on the same facts. *Bernhard v.*
18 *America National Trust & Savings Association*, 19 Cal.2d 807, 812 (1942).

19 Accordingly, Defendants’ motion will be granted without leave to amend and the action
20 will be dismissed with prejudice.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

III. ORDER

- (1) Defendants' motion to dismiss is GRANTED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND;
- (2) The action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE; and
- (3) The Clerk of the Court shall close the file.

DATED: 12/8/06



JEREMY FOGEL
United States District Judge

1 This Order was served on the following persons:

2
3 Carl M. Durham , Jr cmdurham@wwc.com, cmdurham@yahoo.com

4 Michael J. Vartain mike@vartainlaw.com, judy@vartainlaw.com; charissa@vartainlaw.com;
5 ingrid@vartainlaw.com; emelina@vartainlaw.com
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28